



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,552	03/23/2001	Mark S. Igra	41017.P003	6531

25943 7590 03/14/2007
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

HUTTON JR. WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Acknowledgment of Reply Brief

The reply brief filed 02/07/2007 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

Response to Reply Brief

Appellant's arguments filed in the Reply Brief dated 11/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Argument Section "A":

Appellant argues, "Ferrel does not teach a story object (subordinate specification) that references templates, controls, and style sheets (master specification)." See *Response* – Page 2, fourth paragraph, second sentence. Appellant reasons that, although the story objects in Ferrel reference the style sheets (see *Response* – Page 1, last paragraph, second sentence), the style sheets do not reference the controls (see *Response* – Page 2, third paragraph, first sentence). Rather, Appellant argues, the style sheets are referenced by the controls (emphasis in the original text). See *Response* – Page 2, third paragraph, second sentence. Thus, Appellant argues, because neither the story objects nor the style sheets in Ferrel reference the controls, Ferrel fails to disclose a subordinate specification that references

a master specification. See *Response* – Page 1, last paragraph through Page 2, fourth paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

The main issue framed in Appellant's argument appears to be: does Ferrel disclose that the "subordinate specification" **references** the "master specification?" The answer to this question is "yes," as explained in the following discussion.

The examiner has interpreted the "*master specification*" recited in Claim 1 to read on the templates, which comprise the controls and the style sheets, as disclosed in Ferrel. See *Examiner's Answer* – Page 4, last paragraph. Stated differently, the "*master specification*" disclosed in Ferrel comprises:

1. the templates,
2. the controls, **and**
3. the style sheets.

The examiner has interpreted the "subordinate specification" recited in Claim 1 to read on the story objects disclosed in Ferrel. See *Examiner's Answer* – Page 5, last paragraph.

Thus, if the story objects disclosed in Ferrel reference **any** of the templates, controls and style sheets, then Ferrel discloses a "subordinate specification" that references the "*master specification*."

As admitted by Appellant, Ferrel expressly discloses that the story objects of the online newspaper (*i.e.*, the "subordinate specification") reference the associated style

sheets (*i.e.*, the “*master specification*”) before being rendered on the page. See *Reply Brief* – Page 2, first full paragraph, fourth sentence.

Accordingly, Ferrel does disclose that the “*subordinate specification*” references the “*master specification*.”

Regarding Appellant’s observation that Figure 1 of the Specification does not disclose a “*master specification*” that specifies a “*common style*” or a “*common content placement*” (see *Response* – Page 2, last paragraph through Page 3, second full paragraph), the examiner notes that he was merely illustrating that “*subordinate specifications*” which **reference** “*master specifications*” was known in the art at the time the invention was made. That is, the examiner was not attempting to show that Figure 1 of the Specification discloses a “*master specification*” that specifies a “*common style*” or a “*common content placement*.”

Argument Section “B”:

Appellant argues that the two examples of alleged “*common navigation*” provided by the examiner do not demonstrate that Ferrel teaches a master specification specifying a common navigation arrangement. Appellant argues that the first example provided by the examiner merely shows that multiple page layouts may have the same controls and the controls do not determine navigation. Appellant further argues that Ferrel does not specify a method of navigation. Appellant argues that the second

example provided by the examiner merely shows controls that presumably provide navigation for a specific page and nothing in Ferrel teaches that the controls are repeated for another page. See *Response* – Page 3, last paragraph through Page 4, second full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

Firstly, the examiner provided three examples in Ferrel that discloses a “*master specification*” that specifies a “common” navigation arrangement.

Secondly, based on Appellant’s arguments, Appellant appears to limit the “*master specification*” disclosed in Ferrel to only the controls. As previously discussed, the “*master specification*” disclosed in Ferrel comprises:

1. the templates,
2. the controls, and
3. the style sheets.

As explained in the Office Action dated 01/18/2007, the “*master specification*” disclosed in Ferrel teaches a “common” navigation arrangement. See *Office Action* dated 01/18/2007 – Page 7, second full paragraph through Page 8, first full paragraph. The examiner will not repeat the explanation here.

Appellant argues that Ferrel fails to disclose “common navigation” specified by a “*master specification*” because Ferrel fails to teach a “*master specification*” that is referenced by “subordinate specifications.” See *Response* – Page 4, third full paragraph.

Art Unit: 2176

The examiner disagrees.

As explained in the examiner's response to Argument Section "A," Ferrel discloses that the "*subordinate specification*" references the "*master specification*." The examiner will not repeat the explanation here.

Regarding Appellant's comments concerning Figure 1 of the Specification (see Response – Page 4, last paragraph), the examiner notes that, as admitted by Appellant in the Specification and Drawings of the present application, at the time the invention was made, the prior art included:

1. a master navigation page (i.e., "*master specification*") that contained navigation information (i.e., "*common navigation arrangement*"); and
2. subordinate web pages (i.e., "*subordinate content specifications*") that referenced the master navigation page in order to **obtain the navigation information contained therein.**

See Figure 1 in the Drawings. See Page 2, Lines 14-19 in the Specification.

March 6, 2007

WDH



Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100